



## **Governor's ESSA Advisory Committee February 2, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

### **OPENING**

- The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m.
- Secretary Bunting welcomed Advisory Committee members and expressed appreciation for the time they have given to the Committee. Committee Chair Matthew Burrows also welcomed the members.
- The Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the January 11, 2017 meeting (motioned by Senator David Sokola, seconded by Tammy Croce).
- The meeting facilitator went through the evening's agenda and recapped what has taken place since the last meeting. Leadership from DDOE attended an ESSA plan "Critical Friend Feedback" meeting sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) on January 26, 2017.
- This is the final meeting of the Advisory Committee. The final ESSA plan will be released on February 28<sup>th</sup> for public comments.

### **PLAN OVERVIEW**

- Alex Nock of the Penn Hill Group discussed the federal updates. U.S. Secretary of Education nominee Betsy DeVos is in the midst of her confirmation process. Once confirmed, the U.S. Department of Education will send out further clarification on ESSA, including the template for ESSA plans
- Deputy Secretary of Education Karen Field Rogers discussed some of the changes since the Jan. 9 draft:
  - Decision to revise long-term goals and goals for English Language Learners as well.
  - There were some small changes in Section 4; chart was made clearer.
  - Summary from CCSSO ESSA Plan Critical Friend Feedback meeting – very positive about plan. They gave us kudos on stakeholder engagement.
  - Discussed how to lead in Early Childhood, gave some recommendation on how to include in the plan and improve mentions of professional development throughout the plan.
  - Great deal of discussion on English Language Proficiency, new for everyone to have that level of accountability in the system.

### **PLAN FEEDBACK AND DISCUSSION**

Committee members engaged in the following discussion, questions and comments:

- Went back to ESEA waiver request submitted in 2015. ELA and Math goals were set from 2015 to 2021. In ESSA plan, it's bumped out to 2030. Why additional time? Targets in 2021 were slightly higher than targets set for 2030, some slightly lower. What was rationale?

- We are looking at Smarter Balanced data and SAT. We have two years of Smarter data, and one year of SAT, which makes it difficult to project long-term goals. We need one more year of data in SAT.
- Growth to target removed?
  - Received feedback from external people, want to make sure top students are growing.
- State board concerned that 2030 way too far out. They don't understand more aggressive growth target. Trajectory is linear from 2015 to 2030. Need an aggressive path. Too long to hold adults accountable for 12 years. 3-5 years better than 12 years.
  - Interim targets are in appendix A – Karen made note of this.
- Impossible statistically to have all students proficient. Proficiency for them and their ability; some students will not reach the same level of proficiency as others.
- Clarification needed on page 12, grade 11 grade table. Are percentages based on Smarter Balanced? Are they going to change since we are using SAT?
  - One year of SAT, we can relook at goals once we have more years of data. Double check info for what was handed out tonight and what is on website.
- We have schools with smaller enrollment, schools with larger enrollment, in smaller schools teachers have more time to teach for testing. Is it fair to compare when smaller has more attention and larger less time to prepare due to size of classes?
- We still have a technology issue. Having computers and enough access to computers is concerning. Testing windows are also unknown.
- Measures section: Stakeholders thought social-emotional learning should be part of accountability. Don't think we are there yet.
  - People interested in this one, not going to be accountability measure, may be in reporting. Wanted to acknowledge those with the feedback that we heard them and are considering.
- When will College Board be able to have math SAT in Spanish? Unknown.
- How will DSSF and TSI and CSI relate?
  - The DSSF will look at all the schools and see how they are doing. Get the bottom 5 percent of schools that need support. TSI – look at subgroups, compare how they are all doing. Still doing the modeling and looking at the TSI and looking at how to make calculations work.
  - Need more clarification in this piece.
- How to report teacher quality: Dashboard will come on board in fall of 2017. Percent of educators earning exceeds rating – are you using 2016/17 data or 2015/16? There were problems with 2015-16 data.
  - There is a subcommittee meeting, so determinations have not be made.
- DDOE reached out to stakeholders to discuss ELL goals. There are multiple measures, not just WIDA proficiency score.
  - We are still working with the experts to see how it fits, little more work before putting in plan.
- Rating system of 1 through 5 stars is unfair. Parents won't want to send kids to a school with one star there. Why do we want to label them?
  - Explaining ratings and how some are identified as CSI and TSI. Parents/community members look at all the data.
  - We want them to look at the good as well as the bad.
  - Discussion around ratings went into detail on thoughts and opinions.
  - Dashboard will give as much detail as possible to parents and community. Teacher information, specialists, classes offered, etc. As much detail as possible needs to go into dashboard.
  - Preschool uses star system. Figure out good way of how to rate that's appropriate. It is unfair for parents to think it's a great school when it's not. We can't be dishonest and say all schools are great. We have obligation to make all schools great.
  - We don't treat all schools the same. Need to treat all schools equally. Don't agree with system that is going to label our schools, and they are not equally resourced.

## SMALL-GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Committee members broke into small groups to offer further comments on the plan:

### GROUP 1

#### Strengths:

- Feedback from stakeholders has been incorporated into the plan; as a result, the plan is more robust; it is obvious that multiple groups have had the opportunity to provide feedback, and the receptivity to that feedback is appreciated
- More developed sections than the first draft
- Multiple-measures accountability system and the associated weighting
- Growth to Proficiency included
- Consistent messaging that DDOE is still investigating feedback – the plan is not final
- Visuals were very helpful

#### Needs improvement:

- Overall star rating for schools – concern that it doesn't provide meaningful differentiation and that parents will see the overall rating and ignore the rest of the information provided; concern that it is not a true representation of school performance and school quality
- Suggestions: utilize a dashboard and a summative rating to truly represent performance and quality; continue to provide star ratings for each indicator in the DSSF
- Concern with how funding is allocated to TSI and CSI schools in terms of true school-level needs based on local context (big schools not the same as small schools)
- Concern with no further meetings to vet the final state plan given that there are areas still being investigated/undecided

#### Final modifications:

- Be explicit about TSI and the level of involvement of DOE and local control
- Revisit adjustments to EL proficiency in content areas
- Make clear the next steps for schools that do not exit CSI status

#### Framework document:

- No feedback received (had not read)

Also attached is the document that Kendall referenced during the Group 1 share-out.

### GROUP 2

#### Strengths:

- Considering DSSF indicators like chronic absenteeism that we never considered before
- Like what is built in for supports for CSI and TSI – needs assessment, monitoring, planning, choosing models
- Glad that there is equitable access to teachers part of DSSF

#### Needs improvement:

- Funding for CSI and TSI is problematic - TSI schools need funding – need resources to meet expectations
- Need funding for ELs especially – to make sure they are supported appropriately
- No “meat” explaining how we are going to get there (equitable access to teachers) – need a mechanism for inputs

- Need to not repeat AYP (100% proficiency)
- Clarity of how DSSF results in a rating
- How to exit TSI and CSI needs to be clarified
- How will writing be taken into consideration for ELs and the ACCESS assessment? (where most students need longer than six years)
- How to provide content instruction in the native language while also providing EL services

Final modifications:

- Eliminate final star rating
- Social-emotional learning – not in the DSSF as measured component
- Add the EL accountability model based on entry level; long-term EL outcomes
- Need language stating that if existing regulations are thrown out then we get the opportunity to rework our plan (in a reasonable amount of time)
- Add sub-weights within each category of the DSSF
- Need strategies for how to fix educator equity issues

Framework document:

- No comments. Most had not read since the last meeting or did not read at all

GROUP 3

Strengths:

- DSSF is in a good place; great to see growth to proficiency restored
- Section 3 on accountability was strong
- Section on effective educators was strong – seemed that there were fewer “TBDs” and blank spots
- Great to see different measures of performance other than assessments

Needs improvement and modifications (these blended together):

- Star system resulting from DSSF. It’s not a rating of the kid, but parents may not dig into the data. It’s a messaging issue.
- Competitive grants for school improvement
- Lack of native-language assessment for SAT (College Board’s issue)
- Long-term goals would be easier to fathom with a sharper slope, then leveling off. Still some concern that 2030 is too long to wait for improvement that doesn’t seem quick enough
- Lack of specificity for ELL strategies and approaches
- Plan for assisting low-performing schools is not clear, nor is exit criteria for CSI schools. What happens if they don’t meet the exit criteria?
- How can ESSA incentivize excellent educators to come into low-performing schools?
- Concern about TSI – they’ll get the label but no funding to improve

Framework document:

- Too long

**CONCLUSION**

Three members of the public commented about:

- Plan should be more aggressive. Progress could be better. Missed opportunities with parent engagement. Assessments are an issue, ESSA affords option of looking at it, but nothing in the plan on that.

- Conflicted on goals: Setting goals that aren't realistic are useless. Need to do goals that are realistic. Should be a living document, keep improving it. Star issue – rating with simple stars is a disaster.
- Students with disabilities? Where is this information?
- Nothing in the plan on equitable funding.
- Some good metrics on social-emotional learning exist, but not in the plan.
- Time it takes for results – 12 years. CSI and TSI funding money won't be available and should be addressed. 30-day public comment, consider comments that could be accepted. Should allow for more time for plan. Funding for disabled students is not in plan, and ELL students need to be addressed and considered.
- Concerned school that psychologists are not mentioned in plan, and they should be. Look at improvement provided to all professional educators. Delaware is improving training for teachers, need to be afforded to all teachers to include psychologists. Social needs of students need to be addressed. Functional behavior assessment, intervention, coaches for teachers to help in classroom. Collaboration with mental health agencies need to be increased.

This was the final meeting of the Advisory Committee. Senator David Sokola made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Rod Ward; unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.